

Application No. 10/762,179

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action of December 30, 2005, Applicant has carefully considered the rejections of the Examiner in the above-identified application. In light of this consideration, Applicant believes that the claims as now amended are allowable. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims now pending in the application.

In this first office action claim 9 has been objected to. Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 6-7, 13-14, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin (EP 0829933) in view of Nelson (US 5,151,718). Claims 2-4, 8, 10-11, and 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Nelson and further in view of Rajeswaran (US 5,917,524). Claims 5, 9, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Nelson and Rajeswaran and further in view of Kamimura (US 6,266,077). Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Nelson and further in view of Kamimura. Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin in view of Nelson and further in view of Ema et al. (US 6,118,798).

Claims 6, 13, and 19 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 14 have been amended.

Some spelling errors have been corrected the claims as well.

Claim 9 has been objected to. Claims 4 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is believed that the claims as presently amended overcome these rejections. Reconsideration of claims 4, 5, and 9 is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/762,179

Claims 1, 6-7, 13-14, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Guerin (EP 0829933) in view of Nelson (US 5,151,718). It is believed that the claims as presently amended overcome these rejections. Neither Guerin or Nelson teach in combination or alone the employment of calibration uniformity values used in combination with a photodetector array as a reference source to programmable drivers and their feedback loops to adjust light beams to obtain nominal values of intensity on the surface of a photoreceptor. Allowance of claims 1, 6-7, 13-14, and 19 is respectfully requested.


Claims 2-4, 8, 10-11, and 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 5, 9, and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable. Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable. Since claims 2-5, 8-12, 15-18, and 20 are based upon claims deemed allowable they should be allowable too. Allowance of claims 2-5, 8-12, 15-18, and 20, is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/762,179

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment; however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

It is respectfully submitted that the present set of claims, as amended, are patentably distinct over the cited references. In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-6918, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher D. Wait
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,230
Telephone (585) 423-6918

March 20, 2006
CDW/fsl
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20A
Rochester, New York 14644